REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-22 are pending in the present application, of which claims 16 and 17 have

been withdrawn from consideration. By this Amendment, claims 1, 14, and 18 have been

amended. No new matter has been added. It is respectfully submitted that this Amendment is

fully responsive to the Office Action dated January 26, 2007.

Allowable Subject Matter:

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication on page 9 of the Action that claims 4-6

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base

claim and any intervening claims.

However, for at the reasons set forth below, it is submitted that all of claims 1 and 3-22

are allowable.

Claim Objections:

Claims 1, 11, 14 and 18 stand objected to on page 3 of the Action due to minor

informalities. However, it is submitted that claims 1, 14 and 18 have been amended to overcome

the Examiner's objections. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Page 8

As To The Merits:

As to the merits of this case, the Examiner sets forth the following rejections:

- 1. claims 1, 7, 10, 14, 18 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the newly cited reference of Bialo (U.S. Pat. No. 4,719,374);
- 2. claims 1, 3, 7, 10-12, 18 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kohama et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,731,607);
- 3. claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentanble over Bialo (U.S. Pat. No. 4,719,374);
- 4. claims 8-9, 13, 19 and 20-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bialo (U.S. Pat. No. 4,719,374) in view of Matsunaga et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20030016082);
- 5. claim 12 is rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bialo (U.S. Pat. No. 4,719,374) in view of Ayasli et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,012,123); and
- 6. claim 15 is rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bialo (U.S. Pat. No. 4,719,374) in view of Ayasli et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,012,123).

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, as amended, now calls for switching transistors commonly

connected to a connection node used as one of a high frequency signal input terminal and a high

frequency signal output terminal of the switching circuit; a control bias supply circuit that

supplies a control bias for cutting off all the switching transistors to one of a source and a drain

of each of the switching transistors in order to prevent high frequency signal from substantially

propagating through all the switching transistors when all of the switching transistors are in a

non-selected state in which all the switching transistors are turned OFF in response to selection

control signals applied to gates of all the switching transistors. Independent 18, as amended,

now includes similar features.

Bialo:

With regard to the Bialo reference, the Examiner relies specifically on the switching

circuit shown in Figs. 1 and 4 of the reference (please see page 4 of the action). However, while

the circuits of Figs. 1 and 4 show that control voltages are applied to the gates of the transistors

15, 16 and 58, 60, respectively, for switching these transistors, Bialo fails to disclose a control

bias circuit that supplies a control bias to one of a source and a drain of each of the transistors 15,

16 and 58, 60, or node 8, for cutting off these transistors in order to prevent high frequency signal

from substantially propagating through all the switching transistors when all of the switching

transistors are in a non-selected state in which all the switching transistors are turned OFF in

response to selection control signals applied to gates of all the switching transistors.

Page 10

In addition, the transistors 15, 16 and 58, 60 of Bialo are not commonly connected to a

connection node used as one of a high frequency signal input terminal and a high frequency

signal output terminal of the switching circuit, as also called for in claim 1.

Kohama:

With regard to the Kohama reference, the Examiner specifically relies on the switching

circuit shown in Fig. 5 of the reference (please see page 5 of the action). However, while the

circuit of Fig. 5 shows that the control voltage CTL1 is applied to the gates of the respective

transistors FET 11 and FET 12 for switching these transistors, Kohama fails to disclose a control

bias circuit that supplies a control bias to one of a source and a drain of each of the transistors

FET 11 and FET 12 for cutting off these transistors in order to prevent high frequency signal

from substantially propagating through all the switching transistors when all of the switching

transistors are in a non-selected state in which all the switching transistors are turned OFF in

response to selection control signals applied to gates of all the switching transistors.

In addition, the transistors FET 11 and FET 12 of Kohama are not commonly connected

to a connection node used as one of a high frequency signal input terminal and a high frequency

signal output terminal of the switching circuit, as also called for in claim 1.

Page 11

Response

Application No. 10/648,283

Attorney Docket No. 031080

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants

submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request

such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the

Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to

expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate

extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect

to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATFORI, DANJELS & ADRIAN, LLP

Thomas E. Brown

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 44,450

Telephone: (202) 822-1100 Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

TEB/nrp